DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 100 EA 023 704

AUTHOR Shaeffer, Sheldon
TITLE A Framework for Collaborating for Educational Change. Increasing and Improving the Quality of Basic Education IIEP Research and Studies Programme Monograph No. 3.
INSTITUTION United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France). International Inst. for Educational Planning.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 43p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Involvement; *Educational Change; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *International Education; Parent Participation; *Participative Decision Making; *School Community Relationship; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

Within the last 20 years, the idea of "people centered" or participatory development has become more prevalent. The participatory approach to development represents a considerable change in the process of governance, in social and political relationships, and in who participates in, is empowered by, and controls the development process. After discussing the strengths and weaknesses of participatory development, this document gives a thorough examination of the actors involved in the participatory development of education, (government, schools, community, and nongovernment organizations). Each of these "actors" is evaluated according to their knowledge, skills, attitudes, and motivations before discussing how collaboration among each group can more readily occur. The most important element of collaboration relates to the increased participation of teachers, parents, and the community. This may involve the contribution and management of resources, policy and governance, school operations, and the content of the school curriculum. Certain factors and conditions can be consciously created and nurtured in order to make these changes easier to achieve. The document focuses on government commitment, institutional changes, greater professional autonomy at the school level, social autonomy at the community level, and collegiality and continuous improvement at the school level. (79 references) (LAP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342100

IIEP research and studies programme

Increasing and improving the quality of basic education

Monograph No. 3

A framework for collaborating for educational change

Sheldon Shaeffer

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Hall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

EA 023704

International Institute for Educational Planning

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IIEP research and studies programme
Increasing and improving the quality of basic education
Monograph No. 3

A framework for collaborating for educational change

Sheldon Shaeffer

International Institute for Educational Planning

The views and opinions expressed in this volume are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of UNESCO or of the IIEP. The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO or IIEP concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

The publication costs of this monograph have been covered through a grant-in-aid offered by UNESCO and by voluntary contributions made by several Member States of UNESCO, the list of which will be found at the end of this volume.

This volume has been typeset using IIEP's computer facilities
and has been printed in IIEP's printshop.

International Institute for Educational Planning
7 - 9 rue Eugène-Delacroix, 75116 Paris

© UNESCO 1991

Increasing and improving the quality of basic education

Presentation of the series of monographs

The renewed interest being given to basic education calls for the design and implementation of new strategies to stop the present deterioration in the expansion and quality of primary and adult education in various developing countries, especially among the most underprivileged.

In response to this concern, the IIEP has undertaken an extensive programme of research, training and dissemination with a view to reinforcing the decision-making and planning capacities of the different countries. This series of monographs, *Increasing and improving the quality of basic education,* is part of this programme.

The aim of the series is to disseminate, as quickly as possible, relevant documentation on basic education to planners and decision-makers.

Contents

Chapter I	The need for new approaches to increase educational quality and demand	1
Chapter II	Participatory development: what it is and what it can and cannot do	5
	1. Introduction	5
	2. Definitions and characteristics of participation	6
	3. Advantages and disadvantages of participation	8
Chapter III	Collaboration and partnerships in education	13
	1. Actors in participation	13
	2. Where participation and collaboration can occur	20
	3. The factors and conditions which encourage collaboration	23
Bibliography		29

Chapter I

The need for new approaches to increase educational quality and demand

> *"Because basic learning needs are complex and diverse, meeting them requires multisectoral strategies and action which are integral to overall development efforts. Many partners must join with the education authorities, teachers, and other educational personnel in developing basic education if it is to be seen, once again, as the responsibility of the entire society. This implies the active involvement of a wide range of partners -- families, teachers, communities, private enterprises (including those involved in information and communication), government and non-governmental organizations, institutions, etc. -- in planning, managing and evaluating the many forms of basic education".* [WCEFA 1990a:4]

> *"In an uncertain and complex world, planning and administration must be adaptive. They require managers who can facilitate rather than control...skilled people who can act as catalysts...[and] administrators who can respond creatively and quickly to changes...administrators who view themselves as leaders rather than as bureaucrats. It calls for managerial systems in international organizations and governments of developing countries that train administrators to join action with learning, to experiment, to test new ways of doing things and to be sensitive and responsive to the needs of the people they serve".* [Rondinelli 1983:148]

For many people the world is becoming a more difficult place in which to survive. Despite the accumulation of scientific knowledge, giant advances in technology, and the increasingly sophisticated analyses of the social sciences, immense challenges of survival and development remain: the degradation of the environment, the continued increase of population and urbanisation, the dangers of old diseases and the devastation of new ones, the growing strength of extreme nationalisms and fundamentalisms, and the seemingly permanent risks and reality of war and rebellion.

At the heart of the intractability of many of these problems lies persistent economic and social *under*development. This process is gaining momentum in many parts of the world as economic growth slows or stops, debt burdens increase, and adjustment policies, designed to reverse such trends in the long-term, take their short-term bite. Such underdevelopment has two major results. First, inequalities of social and economic status and opportunity increase within and across societies; these feed, and are often exacerbated by, profound cultural, religious, and ideological conflicts. Second, many governments find themselves unable -- and others, less able than in the past -- to provide an adequate quality or quantity of social services to large segments of their populations. The result in many parts of the world is the impoverishment of the middle classes and the further marginalisation of the already poor and disadvantaged.

It is in this kind of situation where education -- of greater quantity and of highest quality -- is most needed. Although education, as indoctrination, can increase tensions and hatreds, it can also lead more usefully both to concrete outcomes such as reduced fertility and mortality rates, increased productivity, and greater environmental awareness and to more general results such as greater adaptability to change and greater tolerance for diversity. But just when sufficient and good education is most needed, in many countries it is less available and of eroding quality. In many of the least developed countries, the growth of primary school enrolment rates is declining while the absolute numbers of school-age children not in school and of illiterate adults are increasing. Even in countries where enrolment rates have continued to grow, a sizeable percentage of children and adults often remains unreached by primary schooling and literacy programmes. And in many countries, both research data and observation indicate a decline in the achievement of learners and in the general quality of education provided them. These trends, which particularly affect education for girls and women, are closely related to declining investment in education measured both as a percentage of the national budget and as per pupil expenditures (WCEFA 1990).

While the growing lack of resources is an important factor in explaining the stagnation of enrolment and the deterioration of quality, the problem of weak demand is also crucial. Many potential learners in the developing world (and increasingly in the developed world as well) are not enrolling in primary schools, education programmes for out-of-school youth, and literacy courses (Anderson 1988, Prakasha 1986, Roy 1984). Reasons for this include the following:

(1) *Economics.* Many families cannot afford education -- even when 'free' -- given the need to provide children in school with uniforms, books, paper, and pencils. Also, the labour of children is essential to the economic well-being of many families, either in productive activities or in the care of younger siblings.

(2) *Gender.* Religious and cultural factors related to the seclusion of women, as well as economic pressures, limit demand for the education of girls. Schooling is often seen as producing less visible returns for girls than for boys and as depriving them of experience at home and with younger children -- experience often seen as their greatest economic asset.

(3) *Culture and politics.* Indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, and political groups at odds with a country's dominant group may be reluctant to send children into a system controlled by what is often seen as a repressive majority culture, language, or ideology.

(4) *Geography.* Sheer distance from schools, the geographic mobility of migrants, and the territorial uncertainty of refugees can also limit demand.

(5) *Health.* Increasing evidence shows that ill-health and malnutrition influence both initial enrolment in school and repetition and drop-out rates (Leslie and Jamieson 1990).

Another increasingly important aspect of demand relates to the perceptions of communities, parents, and children in regard to the utility, relevance, quality and responsiveness of the formal education system. Illiterate parents, particularly those within a generally illiterate environment, may not appreciate the potential of education, economic or otherwise. Or they may be convinced that it has little value at all. More and more people appear to lack confidence that the education system can provide the skills required for children or young adults either to break out of the marginal environment of their community (in order to work, for example, in the formal sector) or to return, with additional skills and knowledge and therefore at some profit, to the daily life of their family and community. Schools and adult education programmes are also often seen as being staffed by unmotivated, uncaring, and frequently absent teachers; leading to repetition and ultimate waste; and seldom interested in relating closely to the community around them. In one province of Cameroon, for example, "the schools are empty for weeks and months when teachers fail to arrive or leave the community after a short period of time. The parents react to this situation and the declining job prospects with an increasing lack of interest" (Bude 1985:262). For all of these reasons, education -- at precisely a time when it is needed the most -- is often seen as having little immediate importance or long-term value, especially in comparison to the actual costs of getting an education and to the earnings foregone in getting it.

Attempts by governments to overcome problems of finance, irrelevant content, inadequate facilities, underqualified teachers, and institutions unresponsive to the needs of particular groups of people have often taken the form of expanding and fine-tuning the traditional and formal school system through (for example) the elimination of formal school fees (which may increase informal ones), the provision of new facilities, the addition of new subjects to the curriculum, and the training and re-training of more teachers. In addition, a variety of alternative, non-conventional, and non-formal approaches to education have been developed in order to make it more accessible and more acceptable to families who, for economic, political, or cultural reasons, are unable or unwilling to participate in schooling and literacy programmes (see Ranaweera 1990, Abreu de Armengol n.d., Dave 1990, Zainal Ghani 1990, Bray 1987, Hamadache 1990). These include such innovations as:

- flexible daily schedules (to fit into children's and adults' work schedules)and yearly calendars (to fit into a family's economic patterns);
- mobile schools, to reach nomadic populations, and small schools, often combined with volunteer teachers, self-instructional modules, and distance education methods, to reach isolated communities with small populations;
- sex-segregated programmes, to overcome cultural barriers to mixed-sex education, and programmes which marry secular and religious education;
- school feeding programmes and the training of older children to care for the health of their younger siblings;
- more flexible age and grade structures to provide a second chance to older children; and
- new policies in regard to language usage in schools and literacy programmes to take into account issues of minority cultures and languages.

But both large-scale reforms of the formal, conventional education system and many of the alternative, more non-formal innovations put in place by the central government have proven difficult to implement, disseminate, and sustain. Debt and recession, the isolation of marginal populations, and the interruptions of war and natural disaster share much of the blame for the persistent inability of many governments both to supply a constant (let alone an increasing) number of educational places and to influence, on a day-to-day basis, the quality of education occurring in their schools. But the limitations of centralised bureaucracies -- and of their traditional technocratic planning techniques -- also play an important role in this regard. Such limitations arise partly from the sheer magnitude and complexity of the problems and partly because "centrally-designed programs are seldom responsive to the needs of the poor; and the organizations through which they are implemented seldom have the capacity to implement these projects as designed, let alone identify the actual needs and adapt the project accordingly" (D. Korten 1981a:213).

External aid to education, designed to improve education and increase the capacity of national governments to maintain and extend it, can often exacerbate rather than help to resolve these problems. Although some assistance agencies have shown flexibility and imagination in supporting innovations, sometimes to the extent of working with both governments and NGOs, they and their consultants often end up designing or prescribing overly complex innovations which overburdened and undertrained national administrations have been unable to implement (Rondinelli *et al* 1990).

In many parts of the world, therefore, good and sufficient education, needed more now than ever before, is more and more difficult to find. Governments, the customary providers of such education (especially at the primary level), are increasingly unable to supply it and, if supplied, to sustain and improve it. As a result, the traditional centralised, top-down processes of educational development are more frequently being called into doubt. In such a situation, governments and donors, decision-makers and planners, educators and trainers must be willing and able to look at other approaches to development and other patterns of planning, financing, and managing education.

This paper will describe one such approach -- that of participatory development. It will define and characterise it, discuss its benefits and risks, and examine in what areas, under what conditions, and in what ways it can be used to encourage greater participation by various partners (teachers, parents, the community, NGOs) in improving basic education. Finally, it will discuss how educational planners and managers can be trained and administrative structures and procedures altered in order to permit and facilitate greater collaboration for educational change.

Chapter II

Participatory development: what it is and what it can and cannot do

1. Introduction

In the last 20 and more years, a very different approach to development -- often called 'people-centred' or participatory development -- has appeared on the scene. This approach begins with the assumption that "sustainable development ultimately depends on enhancing people's capacities as individuals and groups to improve their own lives and to take greater control over their own destinies" (Ogun 1982:2). While this assumption may seem self-evident, a participatory approach to development represents a considerable change in the process of governance, in social and political relationships, and in who participates in, controls, and is empowered by the development process.

Unfortunately, much of what has been written and said about participatory development is more rhetorical than realistic, and so-called 'empowerment of the people' is neither easily achieved nor sustained in the face of political and social oppression or the demands of everyday survival. But despite the vagueness of the rhetoric and the frequent difficulties in implementation, participatory development has become a process of considerable importance in the world. Administrative decentralisation, sometimes accompanied by the genuine devolution of political and budgetary authority, is the trend in many countries. Provinces, municipalities, local governments, and the 'civil society' as a whole are gaining further responsibility for social services and local development -- a responsibility often thrust upon them by increasingly impoverished and impotent State mechanisms.

Accompanying, and often leading, this process is a growing number of ever more powerful non-government organizations and community associations able both to mobilise populations toward collective expressions of economic power and political will and to influence the assessment of local needs and the design, implementation, and evaluation of local development activities. In many nations these organizations are becoming "partners in development" with government agencies, are provided government funding for their work, and are developing often powerful networks of like-minded groups. The result of these processes of administrative decentralisation and popular mobilisation can be the greater participation of people long disadvantaged by class, gender, race, and ethnicity in the institutions, activities, and development processes which affect their lives.

Such 'people-centred' development is not as new as it often appears. The interest in the 1960s in community development, supported by (mostly rural) non-formal education, was linked at least in part to an attempt to make development programmes more relevant and responsive to grassroots concerns. This approach, however, was not necessarily

participatory in method and was challenged in many ways by the conscientisation of Freire who urged that the poor, the usual *objects* of development, become critically aware of the reality in which they lived (conscientised) and take control of their own lives. Such a process places particular emphasis on group discussion, self-reflection, and critical thought *(Bernard Van Leer Foundation 1990)*.

The long tradition of *educación popular* in Latin America, designed to promote more participatory and democratic society, also encourages dialogue and group learning, values both individual experience and collective views, attempts to break the culture of silence characteristic of marginal and oppressed groups, and is oriented to issues of politics and class and to the transformation of society (Bernard Van Leer Foundation 1990, Durning 1989). The liberation promised by Nyerere was less focused on class and promoted indigenous African (as opposed to imported colonial) ways of thinking and acting. In Castro's Cuba and Mao's China, these ideas, though distorted in many important ways, were carried to greater extremes of social transformation, to be achieved (rhetorically at least) through popular participation. Hints of such thinking and traces of such language appeared in the landmark *Alma Ata Conference* on primary health care, and the early 1980s saw the more frequent use of terms such as empowerment, popular participation, and local ownership of the development process in documents of governments and donor agencies as well as NGOs.

2. Definitions and characteristics of participation

Such terms, however, have often remained vague and undefined. Only recently has there been greater clarity in outlining the essential characteristics and implications, as well as the potential benefits and risks, of participatory development. An extensive discussion in development literature concerning participation -- of whom, in what, for what purpose, and to what degree -- has helped greatly in this regard (see, for example, Myers in press, Brownlea 1987, Madan 1987).

As a result, several different degrees of participation in development can be described. These include participation as: (i) the mere *use* of a service (such as a primary health care facility); (ii) participation through the contribution (or extraction) of resources, materials, and labour; (iii) participation through 'attendance' (e.g., at parents' meetings at school), often implying passive acceptance of decisions made by others; (iv) participation through consultation on a particular issue; (v) involvement in the delivery of a service, often as a partner with other actors; (vi) involvement as implementors of delegated powers; and (vii) most completely, participation "in real decision-making at every stage -- identification of problems, the study of feasibility, planning, implementation, and evaluation" (UNICEF 1986:1).

This last definition is generally considered now as being that which underlies genuinely participatory development. Thus, people participate to the extent that they "choose, cognitively, affectively, and physically, to engage in establishing, implementing, and evaluating both the overall direction of a programme and its operational details. Choice, in this context, implies not merely an agreement to follow but an active decision to assume

responsibility in considering the rationale, implications and potential outcomes of the programme" (Bernard 1990:7). Such a definition requires extensive involvement in the various stages of development activities: diagnosing and defining problems; articulating priorities and setting goals; collecting and analysing information and assessing available resources; deciding on and planning programmes; designing implementation strategies and apportioning responsibilities among participants; managing programmes; monitoring progress; evaluating results and impact; and redefining problems generated for further action (Hollnsteiner 1982, NFE Exchange 1981, UNICEF 1986, Durning 1989).

This definition of participation has several important implications. It means that people *gain knowledge and awareness* of their own social, economic, and political conditions (Bhasin 1979). It requires people to *take action* -- to make and act on choices and to construct "their own futures through a process of analysis and action" (Myers in press:310). And above all, it means that people *gain control and power* over resources, over the goals and processes of development, and over regulatory institutions (Hollnsteiner 1982). "If it is accepted that participation should start at the stage of conception and still be in evidence at the stage of supervision, then it is necessary to agree to share certain elements of power" (Bugnicourt 1982:74-5).

This is where the concept of empowerment has become especially important in attempts to move the concept of participatory development from rhetoric to concrete practice. In the process, unfortunately, empowerment has become a much abused word, adopted in many societies by both the political right (who see it as privatisation) and the left (who see it as radical social transformation). It is perhaps best defined as "a group process where people who lack an equal share of valued resources gain greater access to, and control over, those resources" (Bernard Van Leer Foundation 1990:2). As a result, "poor communities come more explicitly to assert rights and responsibilities in determining the direction of their own development" (Bernard Van Leer Foundation 1990:7). This power must be real, formal, and legitimate, including both the ability to use formal structures, regulations, and rules and control over decision processes, knowledge, and techniques. People who are empowered "have the power to find direct solutions to their problems -- they propose solutions, they do not beg for them" (Bernard Van Leer Foundation 1990:5).

Another implication of this definition is that there cannot be a standard recipe for achieving participatory development; what makes it 'work' varies tremendously across different economic, political, and cultural contexts. It is certainly facilitated by the organisation of groups able to provide mutual support to participants and to gather what are often isolated, individual needs into collective demands. And it arises from several processes: through the mobilisation of popular or political will by existing structures (such as political parties), through animateurs or animating organizations, through the process of the "gradual empowerment of local groups or communities which have organised themselves to defend collectively their livelihood and promote their interests" (Stiefel and Racelis 1990:2), and through the conscious decentralisation of government mechanisms or the creation of local institutions of self-government.

The issue of decentralisation is particularly crucial in any attempt to encourage governments to facilitate the participation of a broader range of actors in development.

Decentralisation is a process of growing importance due to what are seen as several key limitations of centralised systems: their limited reach of *effective* service, their inability to promote sustained local-level action, their limited adaptability to local circumstances, and the creation of dependency through their activities rather than self-sufficiency (F. Korten 1981). Because of such limitations, many systems in both the North and the South are going through a process of decentralisation, either by territory (to smaller units) or by function (to NGOs, private groups, etc.). This strategy is meant to achieve various results: (1) to generate more resources and assure their more equitable allocation and effective use within the decentralised administrative units; (2) to improve the quality of decision-making and planning by relating these processes more closely to indigenous cultures and to local conditions, needs, and practices; (3) to encourage innovation and participation; (4) to increase local responsibility and accountability; and (5) to stimulate communication down and (especially) up the system of control. It is ultimately seen to be a "means to ensure wider representation of legitimate interests in education" (Weiler n.d.:4) and to make these interests more responsible for educational quantity and quality.

In theory, decentralisation should lead to the redistribution of power. It has been argued, however, that the process is often more rhetorical than real and, as 'compensatory legitimation', is designed to manage and diffuse conflict and fragment reform movements rather than bring about real change (Weiler n.d.). The important questions in this regard are: (1) *what powers are being decentralised* (e.g., only data collection and not policy-making, only resource extraction and not expenditure) and (2) *why such decentralisation is occurring* (e.g., for the reasons listed above or because an impoverished State can no longer finance its services).

The answers to these questions will determine to some extent which of the various and quite different forms and strategies of decentralisation -- each with its own particular implications for participation and empowerment -- are adopted (Rondinelli *et al* 1990, Hallak 1990, Bray 1987). *Deconcentration* involves handing over authority and decision-making powers from a higher level of the central government to lower levels -- regional, district, cluster -- a first step to local autonomy, but still accountable to, and staffed by, the central ministry. *Delegation* transfers (or lends) certain specific management responsibilities for some activities to other units, governmental or non-governmental, implying somewhat stronger (but easily recoverable) local autonomy. *Privatisation* is the divesting of functions to the private sector, either voluntary or for profit. *Devolution* strengthens sub-national units of government and actually transfers decision-making powers to local bodies. It is in the actual devolution of power to local lower-level bodies of government (and even to community associations and NGOs) that the greatest scope for participatory development can be found.

3. Advantages and disadvantages of participation

It is important to make clear that participation -- and any accompanying devolution of authority and 'empowerment of the masses' -- should *not* be seen as a new panacea for underdevelopment. It is a difficult, frustrating process, sometimes risky and often unsustainable. But in the best of circumstances, it brings two kinds of benefits to

individuals, communities, and society at large. Most directly, greater participation in a particular sector of development (education, health, agriculture) can lead both to a greater demand for the services of that sector and to services more relevant to community needs. More generally, participation can also lead to changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, and the distribution of power across individuals and communities which can enhance people's capacities to improve their own lives and 'empower' them to take greater control of their own development. Such results can in turn lead to development activities which are more immediately useful and successful and, in the longer term, more sustainable (Bernard Van Leer Foundation 1990, D. Korten 1987, Hamadache 1990, Myers in press, UNICEF 1978, UNICEF 1986, Zainal Ghani 1990).

A great part of the impact of participation and empowerment lies at the level of the *individual* and in the context of "human resource development". Some of the impact is cognitive. Through greater involvement in a variety of development activities, people can gain more knowledge, learn better practice, and end with a greater awareness of the problems that exist, the causes behind these problems (which may or may not be amenable to local control), and, in some cases, their possible solutions.

Some of the impact is also psychological: greater self-confidence and self-reliance, less dependence on external inputs and 'wisdom', greater pride in the significance and validity of personal and collective knowledge and experience, a greater sense of accountability and responsibility, less of a feeling of marginalisation and powerlessness. The combination of such impacts can lead to greater demand; people gain a better idea of the kind of life they want to lead, a greater understanding of what prevents them from achieving such a life, greater knowledge about what services (and of what quality) should be available to assist them, and more willingness to make their needs known and, when necessary, to play a larger role in fulfilling these needs themselves.

Much of the same kind of impact occurs at the *community* level as well. Communities can feel and become less marginal and powerless, more self-reliant and independent, more accountable and responsible. Empowered communities can: (1) gain greater control over information and local technologies; (2) form alliances and networks within their own area or across to others; (3) work toward the more efficient and effective management of local resources and, in the longer term, greater ecological sustainability; and (4) develop organisations, structures, regulations, procedures -- a 'corporate identity' -- which can serve them well, both in the whole range of community development activities and as the basis for negotiating, from greater strength, with outside institutions and bureaucracies. The result can be greater social cohesion, economic development, cultural unity, and the assurance that local services -- such as education -- meet the needs, reflect the traditions, and share the goals of the community.

In the best of circumstances, such achievements at the community level are extended to the benefit of the *society at large*. Greater participation within a society can lower development costs (through more volunteer labour and the use of more local expertise and resources), make development programmes more cost-effective, and ensure greater equity of the benefits of development within and across communities. It can also increase the impact and sustainability of development programmes by encouraging more of a "hand-crafted

approach to development" (UNICEF 1986). With such an approach, utilisation rates, continuity, and maintenance of development programmes can be improved (UNICEF 1982). Without such participation, the opposite may occur; thus, for example, "if the educational planners fail to consult the teachers before introducing reforms, they cannot but e· ρect half-hearted support on the part of those concerned with their implementation" (Bude 1985:258).

But both skeptics and advocates of participatory development recognise that it is a process fraught with difficulties, disappointments, and unkept promises (Brownlea 1987, Bude 1985, Bude n.d., Dove 1980, Hollnsteiner 1982, Madan 1987, NFE Exchange 1981, UNICEF 1978, UNICEF 1986, Zainal Ghani 1990). "For some [participants]...the benefit of the participatory process is suspect; the participation involves people who have less skills or knowledge than those responsible for making decisions, are less accountable for whatever the outcome might be, or have a more self-interested level of involvement or concern than perhaps might be expected of the ultimate decision-makers. In these situations and for these people, participation is burdensome, an unwarranted cost, and does little to improve the quality of the eventual decision" (Brownlea 1987:605).

Several issues are important in this regard. First, many communities, it is argued -- perhaps especially those most disadvantaged -- are not at all homogeneous in nature. Social stratification, divisions along caste and ethnic lines, personal rivalries and social factionalism, the incompatibility of interests are all factors which make it very difficult to talk of 'community' mobilisation through participation. A community seen as 'natural' in some ways (such as a caste) may not necessarily be the community most appropriate to mobilise towards a particular outcome (such as sanitation), and a community defined by geography, perhaps most appropriate for improving sanitation, may be too riven with social discord to permit mobilisation. In such a context, participation may bring unresolved and unresolvable conflicts out into the open, exacerbating rivalries of class, caste, and ethnicity by making explicit potential differences in goals and tactics, rather than keeping them constrained and hidden through the operation of traditional roles and responsibilities.

Second, skeptics argue that marginal communities (and many governments) cannot bear the added expense of participatory processes -- often in terms of financial resources and at least in terms of the time and energy of participating community organisations, government agencies, and individuals. These processes can also raise expectations, and then frustrations, and lead to greater political and social instability, and they can mislead marginal populations, who have little margin for risk, into taking risks and then failing, with possible disastrous effects. Others argue as well that the lack of a participatory, grass-roots tradition in many societies (often accompanied by a sense of fatalism about their future and skepticism about their efficacy) and a lack of technical expertise, supervisory skills, and animateurs lead inevitably to failed projects or a decline in the quality of services provided and therefore lead back to extensive co-operation with external, professional agents.

Third, the participatory process may place greater power in the hands of the 'wrong' people -- factionalists, demagogues, racists, reactionaries. It can also be taken over by those parts of any community -- i.e., often corrupt and inefficient local elites and party cadres -- most able (financially and personally) to 'participate'; these groups may use their increased

authority to manipulate the 'participants' and extract further resources from them. Any attempt to encourage *community* involvement in development may therefore lead instead to the encouragement of people who speak only for given segments of the population. It is they, rather than the 'poorest of the poor', who benefit. The result may be an unequal distribution of participation itself and of its benefits -- either of the direct benefits meant to be derived from the new service or of the more generalised benefits of involvement in the development process.

Fourth, a further negative outcome of participatory processes may be the domination, at the local level, of narrow community self-interest, which may be based on short-term perspectives and aim at short-sighted benefits. Such self-interest may ignore longer-term political or economic implications for the community or the larger society and contradict more general goals of national integration, the dissemination of scientific truth, and the modernisation of society. Also, 'popular' traditions and customs in areas such as health, nutrition, productivity, or social justice may, in fact, represent "developmentally inadequate practices and behavior" (Rondinelli 1983:139) which should not be reinforced in development programmes or reflected in local social services (Schwille et al 1986).

Fifth, another problem lies in the risk of tokenism -- only marginal change, wrapped in new packaging, leading not to an alternative model of development but rather to the reinforcement of central power and the reproduction of central values. Participation, in other words, may end up being 'system-maintaining', "designed to transform disadvantaged and disaffected groups into 'responsive citizens' implementing policies outlined by some higher authority" rather than 'system-transforming', designed to "effectively transfer political and economic power to hitherto disadvantaged groups and thus to introduce more radical social change" (Pearse and Stiefel 1980:65). Attention paid and energy wasted by the general population on such token achievements are then lost to attempts to change more fundamentally the basic political and administrative patterns of a society. The process of change therefore becomes de-politicised. Likewise, the very public efforts to wrap the new package in an attractive cover can make it possible for a government to opt out of its responsibilities for delivering basic social services and for the better management, or more equitable allocation, of resources. This may end up with the government co-opting NGOs and other community-based associations into State mechanisms and bureaucratic processes.

Sixth, the demands of participation can threaten the political order of things. In simple terms, for example, "how many of the ruling elite would be comfortable with a critically conscious peasantry, and how many teachers with a body of educands who are developing critical consciousness?" (Dent Ocaya-Ladiki, quoted in Bude 1985:275). The result may be suspicion and fear among the elite and repression of the population.

Seventh is the sheer inability to know, and to show to others, when a participatory process has succeeded. Participation *is* a process and its products are, as described above, often psychological, procedural, or organisational in nature rather than concrete in terms of money saved or services delivered. "As a process, participation evolves at its proper pace and rhythm, adapted to the people involved rather than to bureaucratically or politically defined projects or goals. It may go in unforeseen directions and may not in the short term have an immediately quantifiable or measurable impact" (Stiefel and Racelis 1990:3). The

lack of process indicators and measures means that success is easy to claim but difficult to substantiate.

A final problem relates to the inability to standardise or generalise the implementation of participatory development due to the different configurations of participation in various regions of the world and even in different parts of a country. There are many reasons for such variety: different histories of development, different social relationships and cultural traditions related to participation, and different political constraints or freedoms. Attempts to develop manuals, guidelines, and training materials related to participatory approaches must therefore be tempered by their extensive adaptation to local conditions.

Despite these problems, however, participatory approaches to development have proven instrumental, in particular contexts and under particular conditions, in expanding the supply and increasing the relevance of basic social services and in enhancing people's capacities as individuals and as groups to improve their own lives and to take greater control over their own development. This occurs most readily, of course, under two conditions: (1) that the users of this approach recognise, and move to control, the possible negative aspects of participation described above, and (2) that the dominant actor in development -- the government -- is committed, at all levels, to working more collaboratively with, and encouraging the greater participation of, other partners in development. In order to encourage more active partnerships in educational development at the school and community level and the greater participation by educational personnel and the community in educational matters, it is necessary for governments and the donor agencies which support them to affirm such a commitment and then move to develop the organisational norms, the skills and attitudes, and the structures and procedures required to implement more participatory development.

Chapter III

Collaboration and partnerships in education

> *"The educational system should not be regarded as a branch of the bureaucracy. Instead, it should be a subsystem highly interactive with all other parts of the social whole. The point is to give pupils, parents and teachers responsibility over their own affairs, to the point of enabling them to administer the educational system on their own within the context of natural or contractual communities. This assumption of responsibility must necessarily embrace three indispensable areas: participation in design and decision-making processes; regular, structured involvement in the processes of management and evaluation; and finally financial accountability with regard to both income and contributions"*
>
> [Ki-Zerbo 1990:86]

1. Actors in participation

Before discussing how greater collaboration among partners in education can more readily occur, it is necessary to understand clearly the characteristics of the major actors in this process: the government, the school, the community, and non-government organisations. What, in other words, do these actors typically 'look like' -- their knowledge, skills, attitudes, and motivations; the organisations in which they work and their procedures of work; and the norms and values which form the 'culture' which surrounds them? And which of these factors are most critical to reinforce or alter in attempts to increase the effectiveness of participatory approaches to educational development?

(i) The government

> *"The administration administers: it does not delegate, it does not negotiate, it does not consider groups of peasants or town-dwellers as partners. When it asks for their participation, its aim is the execution of predetermined tasks at the lowest possible cost, or else the alleviation of its own obligations".* [J. Bugnicourt, quoted in Stiefel and Racelis 1990:6]

Government administrators and experts usually bring to their work considerable knowledge, skills, and experience. Older educational administrators may often have started their careers as teachers but have likely worked more years in various parts and at various levels of the ministry structure. Younger ones may have moved directly into ministry positions following university or college training. Their experience has largely been gained, therefore, in academic or office settings (or even in study abroad) rather than in the field. As a result, government officials often have limited knowledge of current community conditions or local experience. Such a perspective, likely reinforced in a position within the central bureaucracy, tends to produce a particular set of attitudes and motivations toward development. In reference to health care, one observer describes a common perception among government managers that "all knowledge, the necessary clinical skills and insights,

the right strategies, the right perceptions of the health problems at the local area, all supposedly reside at the centre of the centralised system" (Brownlea 1987:612).

One effect of this perception are particular attitudes toward the 'periphery'. These include: (1) the retaining of firm control over the development process by the centre with full confidence that the periphery will implement the centre's decisions as required; (2) the assumption that lower levels of the bureaucracy are capable merely of implementing policies and decisions made at the top; (3) little appreciation of (or even scorn for) local or indigenous knowledge or creative potential of what are seen as largely passive 'beneficiaries' (UNICEF 1982, Myers in press), especially in comparison with the supposed expertise of professionals in the centre (F. Korten 1981); (4) little recognition of the potential or achievements of local institutions; and (5) a sense that none could be more or less equal in collaboration for development.

> *"One often hears the city people talk in contempt about the village people. They call the masses lazy, ignorant, conservative, fatalistic, even stupid...They have no respect for the wisdom of the masses, for the wealth of their experience. They do not realise that the masses have managed to survive and keep the economics of [their] countries going not because of the help of the city people, but in spite of their exploitation by the moneyed and landed urban and rural elites".* [Bhasin 1979:70-71]

Frequently related to this is a top-down mentality of officials "whose existence is based on transmitting instructions from above, giving orders to people below them, strictly obeying instructions received (or making a show of it) and making the boss happy" (Pinney 1983:43). This can lead to the discouragement and even the fear of diversity, local initiative, and conflict; the avoidance of open consultation and interaction, except with other professionals speaking the same language; the desire to control information, events, and people; and, ultimately, a resistance to change in structures or procedures. The principle motivation of the public servant and the expert therefore becomes the maintenance and control of the *status quo*.

So, too, more generally for governmental structures and procedures (F. Korten 1981, Duke 1990, UNICEF 1982). The typical unitary, centralised, hierarchical structure of administration, based on departmental and/or disciplinary lines and frequently staffed with insufficient and underqualified personnel, tends to make difficult any attempt to integrate development efforts. Communication, when it exists, flows down such a structure, with few opportunities for the reverse. And many governments have neither the financial nor human resources to penetrate regularly and systematically, even through local offices, to all of a country's villages and settlements, let alone to those most isolated and marginal. With such a limited reach, governments are hard-pressed to implement standardised policies, let alone react flexibly to the particular needs of diverse communities.

These limitations are particularly acute in increasingly expensive and complex educational systems. "The geographical dispersion of school and the organisational tradition of teacher independence in the classroom give education all of the characteristics of a decentralised enterprise. Yet, in most developing countries the education system is hierarchically structured, with most of the important decisions made by central government

ministries" (Rondinelli et al 1990:120). The result is often an attempt "to enclose people in standardized rules, regulations, and official institutions, thereby discouraging voluntary initiatives and promoting apathy, withdrawal and often passive resistance" (Stiefel and Racelis 1990:50).

From this come inflexible procedures (of planning, decision-making, implementation, evaluation, accountability, etc.) which favour quick solutions, rapid assessment of quantifiable output, and immediate success. In such a system, there is usually little advantage seen in attempts to encourage messier, more complex, and potentially less immediately visible and successful activities. This generally rigid approach is reinforced by the importance assigned to national goals of unity and integration and by the necessity imposed by both internal auditors and external funders for detailed and finite planning and budget cycles, work schedules, and target dates. Such pressures can make it difficult to adapt to local circumstance and therefore tempt a ministry to finish a project, declare it a success, and move to yet another rather than reinforcing the operations, maintenance, and sustainability of the first (F. Korten 1981). This approach has been called the 'blueprint approach', reflecting "the textbook version of how development programming is supposed to work"...with..."clear-cut orders, allocation of funds for precisely-stated outcomes, reliance on 'hard' data and expert judgement, and the clearly-stated implementation schedules [which] make project justification easy in budget presentations" (D. Korten 1981:4).

In such a system, evaluation of staff performance is based on development projects completed or budget spent rather than local capacity developed, and personnel are accountable solely to superiors within the bureaucracy and not to the so-called beneficiaries; they also tend to be interchangeable from one location or department to another (F. Korten 1981). As long as members of the bureaucracy "remain unconvinced that they need the willing co-operation of local-level people to improve their performance in ways significant to their careers, they are unlikely to facilitate 'animation techniques' and they may well sabotage them" (Charlick 1980:6).

(ii) The school

The school, as an actor in educational development, is composed of teachers and managers. Both are included in this heading, though their roles in various contexts are often quite different. In some contexts, headmasters are seen as the lowest end of the *government* bureaucracy, trusted to carry out its adminstrative tasks and delivering its educational instructions to teachers; they therefore tend to share many of the characteristics of the government administrators described above. In other contexts, however, headmasters are seen more as senior teachers -- above all responsible for pedagogical issues, with adminstrative tasks added on, but generally treated in the same way as teachers by the bureaucracy.

Though there is, of course, a huge variety of conditions in schools within and across countries of the developing world, there are certain characteristics more or less common to schools of poorer countries and for marginal and disadvantaged populations. There are shortages of books and materials and inadequate or deteriorating facilities. For teachers there are insufficient and irregularly paid salaries, an absence of professional supervision

and assistance, poor promotion opportunities and living conditions, the burden of excess subject content, reduced prestige, low enrolment rates, and often absent pupils (or sometimes overcrowding). "Nearly everywhere [teachers] suffer from a sense of grievance. One reason for this is that their rates of pay are usually not so favourable as those of many others who have received the same amount of education. Another reason in many countries is that their prestige, which once was high in rural areas when they were the only educated person, has inevitably slumped with the spread of education" (V.L. Griffiths, quoted in Bude 1985:259). The result can be heavy teacher absenteeism, an erosion of self-confidence (and of community confidence in teachers), a feeling of non-accountability to parents and the community, and a general decline in respect (Williams 1989).

Teachers also often consider themselves masters or mistresses of their classrooms, trained and certified, and therefore little interested either in receiving advice from superiors or in sharing experience with peers. For a similar reason, they also often reject the involvement of parents in issues relating to teaching and learning, having the attitude that parents, generally 'unaware' of the benefits of education, should 'surrender' their children to the school from the age of six or seven and thereafter not get involved in its activities. Yet teachers also often have considerable knowledge of their pupils and their environments and of what is feasible and useful in the context of the local school. Such experience, however, is often ignored both by the central bureaucracy and by local officials, supervisors, and even headmasters. This is partly because such officials are often chosen more for seniority of tenure than for expertise and thus may have neither the knowledge nor the status to assist their colleagues professionally. Mechanisms of teacher support, let alone of administrative or pedagogical consultation, are therefore often weak.

Finally, and more generally, schools are often only 'loosely coupled' to the larger education system (Cohn and Rossmiller 1987). While part of a network of central, regional, and local interests and heavily dependent on complementary institutions and sub-systems (training colleges, examination systems, curriculum development centres, various statistical offices at several levels, all requiring periodic reports), they are often only weakly linked, at the end of a long chain of command, to this bureaucracy. This makes problematic the success of any central and standardised reform at the school level.

(iii) The community

The nature of the 'community' and of the conditions which determine its fate are perhaps even more varied than those of the 'school'. Communities can be defined by law and geography, culture and language, class and caste. They can be heterogeneous or homogeneous, united or conflictive, poor or rich, sunk in fatalism or vibrant with optimism (and the last are not necessarily correlated with levels of prosperity). They can be governed and managed by leaders chosen democratically (informally or through formal channels) and acting relatively autonomously from other levels of government, or by leaders imposed from above and representing central authorities. Many communities, especially in disadvantaged areas, lack homogeneous social units and even informal local organisations which might be mobilised for greater participation (F. Korten 1981). Each of these characteristics will influence the degree to which communities themselves, their leaders, and any existing

community-based associations are involved -- or are able and willing to be involved -- in development issues, including education.

In general, especially in socially and economically marginal regions, communities are not deeply involved in formal education. There are several reasons for this: (1) a lack of appreciation of the overall objectives of education; (2) a mismatch between what parents expect of education and what the school is seen as providing; (3) the belief that education is essentially the task of the State; (4) the length of time required to realise the benefits of better schooling; and (5) ignorance of the structure, functions, and constraints of the school (UNESCO/PROAP 1990). Any involvement is largely extractive in nature; that is, community participation is limited to the provision of resources -- money, materials, labour. Other, more substantial involvement in terms of consultation or management or control -- in the diagnosis of needs, the development and implementation of school policies, the design of educational content, or the delivery or evaluation of such content -- is usually seriously constrained, either because of the energies consumed in the community's struggle for survival or because of the school's disinterest or resistance to community or parental involvement in what are often seen as specialised and professional matters. The mobilisation of communities to play a larger role in education, and of school personnel to work with communities, is therefore not an easy task (Dubbeldam 1990).

But communities have strengths of their own -- energy, resources, knowledge, and experiences -- all rarely used in centrally- and bureaucratically-determined development programmes. "That the rural poor continue to survive under the most extremely unfavorable circumstances is testimony to the fact that they possess a good deal of technical and social knowledge relevant to their condition -- knowledge of which many a university trained technician may be unaware. The best solution to any given village level problem is likely to be one to which both the technician and the villager have contributed their respective knowledge" (D. Korten 1981a:210).

(iv) Non-government organisations

In 1987 $2.2 billion (or 5 per cent) of the world's official development assistance was provided by donors to non-government organisations; another $3.3 billion was added to this total through NGO efforts (OECD 1988:82-3). This considerable sum and percentage have no doubt increased over the last few years. As NGOs play an increasingly large role in the collection and distribution of development assistance, their involvement in the planning and delivery of development programmes also mounts.

There is no universally accepted definition or classification of NGOs (or PVOs -- private voluntary organisations -- as they are often called). Some classifications include under one label organisations ranging from small village-level associations through national institutions operating in thousands of villages to international agencies with hundreds of staff and dozen of regional and national branches (Hall n.d.). Others distinguish between grassroots organisations of the poor and 'popular' sectors (such as peasant movements, tribal associations, women's clubs, and labour unions) and more "intermediate" agencies or non-government *development* organisations (NGDOs) -- "non-profit private organisations staffed by (semi)professionals who are engaged, full-time, in the design and implementation

of grassroots development projects and programmes with and for the poor in the third world" (Wils 1990:1). Yet others include profit-making organisations, foundations, churches and missions, medical organisations and hospitals, unions and professional organisations, business and commercial enterprises, and co-operatives and cultural groups (OECD 1988, Pinney 1983). NGOs can also be classified as "sectoral, integrative, action-oriented, research-based, educational bodies, policy organizations, politically focused, or any combination of the above" (Hall n.d.:5).

Recent literature has developed more precise classifications of NGOs through an analysis of their evolution. In this analysis, NGOs have developed from agencies primarily concerned with relief and welfare activities, to those encouraging small-scale, self-reliant local development projects and processes, to those more directly involved with community empowerment and social transformation (Elliott 1987). Further evolution has led to two other categories (Bhatnagar 1990). One is the type of large, umbrella, 'policy-advocacy' NGO, in some ways a sector in itself, which forms networks or federations of advocacy organizations and develops distinct social, political, and economic functions and influence within the policy-making processes of a country. Another is the 'service provider' organisation which sees its role more in terms of supporting, protecting, linking, and developing the capacity of a myriad of action-oriented but often weak and relatively powerless grassroots NGOs -- "more in the manner of a foundation, directing its attention to facilitating development by other organizations, both public and private, of the capacities, linkages, and commitments required to address designated needs on a sustained basis" (D. Korten 1986:12).

Such diversification of roles should not obscure a general commonality of functions and characteristics. In ideal terms, NGOs are most often described as people-centred, flexible and responsive, creative, democratic and non-hierarchical, cost-effective and pragmatic, often independent and non-aligned (Hall n.d.). They generally develop as the result of community support, are able to tap local knowledge and resources, and usually have a small core of paid staff and (often) many volunteers. They are concerned with empowering the poor and the oppressed; with building and strengthening people's organisations and community associations; with re-energising, and rejuvenating social movements; and with promoting democratic practices and processes (Tandon n.d.). They see development "not merely as an activity geared towards producing a certain output but as a process of developing community motivation and awareness, of promoting people's abilities so that they can help themselves and, in turn, create a self-reliant community and nation" and "have an approach which stresses the participation of all involved parties in each stage of the development process" (Hadad 1983:10).

NGOs generally carry out several functions: (1) they provide development services in those fields, activities, or regions either underserved by government or parallel to those provided by the government, often with greater effectiveness and equity. More and more frequently, they also work directly *with* governments (and sometimes with donors) in the provision of services, often as an intermediary between government agencies and the poorest levels of society (PRISMA 1983, Annis 1987). (2) they explore new issues of social concern and experiment and test new approaches to development and service delivery; (3) increasingly, within individual countries and internationally through networks and

federations, they serve as advocate and 'noise-maker' in regard to issues such as the environment and health, human rights, women's issues, and peace (Tandon n.d.), and (4) they help to build consensus and initiate policy change around such issues (Bhatnagar 1990).

Given these functions and characteristics, there is clearly a clash of organisational norms and cultures between government and aid agency bureaucracies and non-governmental organisations -- a clash which can often lead to adversarial relationships and to government intimidation and regulation (Tandon n.d.). One problem is the differing unit of activity -- the discrete, defined, elaborately planned and budgeted, and carefully timed 'project' of governments and aid agencies versus the more interactive, unbounded, often vaguely-defined and open-ended 'process' of NGOs.

Another problem is the ingrained suspicion between the two 'sides'. Governments often believe that NGOs encourage division and sow discord between the people and government agencies, expose government shortcomings, and confuse people concerning government aims. They also often feel that NGO activities, by raising questions concerning economic distribution, social control, and the accountability of power -- and even the very models and frameworks of development in place -- are a challenge to State authority; this may particularly be the case in one-party states where the party itself is seen as the 'voice of the people' and therefore the channel through which all community-level work should flow (Tandon n.d.). NGOs, on the other hand, often believe that government officials and bureaucracies are inefficient and slow with a limited capacity for intellectual and technical inputs, more interested in personal gain than social welfare, dominated by corruption, biased toward support to the elites and other civil servants, and ignorant of the real problems of the people (Pinney 1983, Picon 1990). And they believe that the more and more frequent legislation and regulation concerning NGOs in the developing world may cripple rather than support their activities.

As NGOs increase in number and gain in credibility and influence, and as more and more development assistance, both international and national, is channelled through them, they face, as a sector, many important issues. These include: (1) the fear that increased funding of NGOs may lead towards the privatisation of services to the poor and thus the withdrawal of the State from its social responsibilities; (2) the trend for NGOs to become sub-contractors for development programmes designed and funded by others rather than creative, responsive actors in their own right; (3) the risk that the increasing co-ordination of NGOs, either through government regulation or donor preference, might harm their principal focus on decentralised, community-based initiatives; and (4) the possibility that too much NGO criticism of the policies and programmes of the State might weaken it at the expense of international, exploitative forces.

The basic question is how can "the provision of resources and capacities from the State and its agencies to the NGOs be done in a manner that does not undermine the latter's autonomy and independence, but in fact contributes towards strengthening the same?" (Tandon n.d.:24). This is the fear of some NGOs of the possibility of dependency and co-optation -- that too close an approach to government on the part of NGOs, and too great an acceptance of funding from national governments and international donors, will make

them lose their identity and their (often) hard-won autonomy. But others fear that if NGOs are too small in scale, they become insignificant; if too independent, powerless; if too low-cost, of low quality; and if too innovative, temporary and unsustainable (Annis 1987:129). NGOs therefore need to "learn to sup with a long spoon and to balance co-operation and confrontation in their dealings with officialdom" (Duke 1990:209).

2. Where participation and collaboration can occur

Given the quite profound differences between government agencies and non-government organisations, and given the usual patterns of interaction among the other various actors in education at the school and community level, it should be clear why it can be difficult to develop and maintain collaboration and genuine partnerships among them. The technocratic, centralised, uniform, supposedly 'scientific' authority usually imposed by the State -- with all of its related values, priorities, and approaches -- is not easily wed to, or even tolerant of, the more culturally-based, decentralised, diverse, supposedly traditional authority derived from the 'people'.

Such differences are reflected in differing views of how schools can best be managed:

> *"Those who champion democratic participation in education believe that communities will be served best when decision-making is decentralised and when people -- teachers, parents, and students alike -- are encouraged to participate directly in making the decisions that affect them....In contrast to this view, the notion of administrative leadership is one which implies hierarchical elevation of the...principal to an extraordinary level of power, centralising decision-making and control of resources in the hands of the few....It is assumed that strong leaders, with their expertise, technical know-how and experience, can solve administrative problems more efficiently than could cumbersome and wasteful community participation in decision-making".*
>
> [Rizvi, quoted in Gregg 1989:19]

The ideal compromise between such views -- the ideal partnership or 'hybrid' of such forces (Hallak 1990) -- would accept the need for some kind of central government agenda or framework to establish common goals, general policies, national planning processes, basic content, and uniform standards and "to co-ordinate local action, reconcile divergent interests and protect the weak, the losers, and, sometimes, minorities" (Stiefel and Racelis 1990:3). At the same time it would recognise the right of local authorities and of the popular sectors to adapt and implement this framework and fill it with local content. It would encourage a distribution of power in which either side has an equal opportunity to influence the other (Gregg 1989), and it would respect the traditional wisdom of local communities, the experience of teachers and principals, and the legitimacy of non-government organisations. It would also encourage the exchange of experiences, information, techniques, approaches, and resources among governments, NGOs, and community groups.

Most importantly, perhaps, this ideal partnership would see the usual 'controllers' of development -- governments and the donors which support them -- rather as 'enablers', charged with permitting other actors to assume both the rights and the risks of being partners in educational development (Myers in press, Garilao 1987, Duke 1990) and with "preserving, protecting, opening or creating necessary 'spaces' -- political, legal, social, economic, and cultural -- for participation to emerge and thrive" (Stiefel and Racelis 1990:3). It would encourage participation by these actors, not only to share responsibility with them for the failure of projects and programmes, but also to build the capacity of otherwise marginal groups through collaboration in assessing needs, designing and managing programmes, and making decisions. Finally, it would reduce the "constraints to local initiatives imposed by absolute and unresponsive administrative forms" (Hollnsteiner 1982:14) and search for the optimal, if ever-changing, mix of centralised and decentralised structures and procedures (Rondinelli et al 1990).

To achieve such an ideal mix or balance is a difficult task. If achieved, it can be fragile and highly dependent on the personalities of the actors involved or on the nature of ever-changing political and economic conditions. But there are quite concrete areas where such collaboration and participation in education should most probably work and where concrete evidence is available to prove that they have. There are also certain conditions and factors which, although dependent on context and time, tend to encourage the development and sustainability of such collaboration.

This collaboration relates to the increased participation both of teachers and of parents and the community (directly or via community associations and NGOs) in school. Such participation in education can be analysed in terms of both the *degree* and the *area* of participation. The *first*, related to the earlier analysis of the possible kinds of participation in development, posits a range of involvement of outside actors in school, from (1) complete non-participation and exclusion from school affairs, except (usually) in the provision of resources, through (2) assistance (at home) with motivating children and helping them with homework, to participation as (3) an 'audience' and as passive supporters at school-run meetings or assemblies, (4) 'consultants' on school issues, (5) 'partners' in teaching or even training, (6) implementors of delegated powers, and (7) ultimately, citizens or a community in control of the school (Gregg 1989, Stallworth and Williams 1983, Arnstein 1976).

Second, this possible range of collaboration with outside actors, as well as the more active participation of teachers within and across schools, can further be seen in relation to involvement in several different areas of education: (1) school resources, (2) policy and governance, (3) school operations, and (4) the instructional programme, comprising both educational content (the curriculum) and methods (the pedagogy).

The first involves *the contribution and management of resources*. Participation, as we have seen, is often defined as extraction; that is, parents and the community at large are seen as sources of financial and material support and of physical labour but are otherwise not encouraged to participate in school activities. This does not need to be the case. The provision of labour, for example, might include help not only in building and furnishing classrooms and buying textbooks but also in organising pre-schools or day-care centres and assisting as teaching aids. More significantly, both teachers and parents (the latter through

school committees or parent groups) can assume a larger role in examining and approving school budgets and, preferably in collaboration with school managers, in deciding how resources, both parental and governmental, might be spent.

Policy and governance represent a further area where collaboration can be encouraged. First, teachers can be encouraged to play a more collective and collegial role in this area, with more responsibility for setting policies related to school calendars and timetables, enrolment and promotion, and educational content. Of greater importance, perhaps, is community involvement in policy and governance.

> *"A more decentralised governance structure is needed so that schools, as unique educational entities, can offer their local communities the services, programmes, and activities which they desire....If adults are going to develop this ownership and commitment to their local schools, the governance of education must be decentralised so they can participate in decision-making activities, at the local school level, which directly influence the quality and quantity of education offered to children. The school committees, school councils or parent-teacher groups established to facilitate participatory decision-making must be based on a collaborative management philosophy of governance".*
>
> [Sander and Murphy 1989:41]

This includes "the establishment, modification, and implementation of schools' goals and objectives. This type of involvement would allow parents to shape the tone of their school, have it conform to their value systems, and truly address their perception of the type of schooling their child receives" (Gregg 1982:46).

Participation in *school operations* is another possible area of collaboration both among teachers and with the community. Again, school committees and PTAs can assist school personnel in issues such as administration and discipline, and community groups, through the suasion of traditional authority, can help encourage or even compel school enrolment and attendance (Bude 1985, Singhal et al 1986). Involvement in identifying and selecting staff is a further area for possible community participation in the day-to-day operations of the school as is participation in the evaluation of both student achievement and general school operations.

A final area of potential greater participation lies in *the instructional programme*, both *its content and its pedagogy*. Curricular content, teaching materials, and even texts can be chosen or developed in collaborative ways. Teachers themselves can be given more responsibility for such work, perhaps to assess local needs and adapt or enrich centrally-determined curricula and material. The involvement of parents and local community leaders may help to ensure the use of local content, the marriage of traditional and modern knowledge, coverage of local culture and history, and the inclusion of economically-relevant practical subjects (Punch and Bayona 1990). And teachers, parents, and even pupils can be involved in collecting information for such material and in designing various practical school activities (Bude 1985, Dave et al 1990).

The process of instruction may also provide room for collaboration. Teachers can work together to evaluate each other's teaching, assess training needs, design and test upgrading activities, and therefore develop, among themselves, greater personal and professional capacity (Veda et al 1986, Shaeffer 1990). Parents and community groups, though usually kept clearly away from what are considered 'professional' matters of teaching processes, may also have a role to play in monitoring and supervising classroom performance and teacher absenteeism, in participating in in-service training activities, and in serving as teacher aids or teaching resources for particular subjects (Durning 1989).

In summary, there are major roles which teachers within schools -- and parents, community associations, and NGOs from outside of schools -- can play in attempts to improve educational quality. The conditions necessary to introduce some kinds of collaboration -- the establishment of school committees or PTAs, for example -- may appear quite simple to put in place. But to guarantee genuine participation as we have defined it -- to empower teachers and the community to gain the necessary knowledge and skills to participate and the necessary power to take action -- requires a considerable change in the way education is planned and managed and therefore the conscious enhancement of those factors and conditions which encourage participation.

3. The factors and conditions which encourage collaboration

Greater collaboration and greater participation by the under-represented do not occur because they are willed or legislated. "Success requires major transformations in the way an agency performs its task, in the way the community relates to the agency, and in the way the society views the poor and their rights. Such transformations are inevitably slow and filled with set-backs" (F. Korten 1981:199-200). These transformations have been called "micro-policy reforms" which "depend on the accomplishment of highly complex and difficult institutional changes -- commonly involving the development of significant new capacities and norms and a redefinition of institutional roles. Needed re-orientation of existing professional and managerial practice may depend on achieving changes in deeply held personal and professional values" (D. Korten 1986).

Certain factors and conditions can be consciously created and nurtured in order to make these changes easier to achieve. Some can be considered as *institutional and system-wide norms*. The first of these norms required for the encouragement of optimal collaboration is central, *governmental commitment* to "removing obstacles to participation -- ideological, structural, and administrative" (Stiefel and Racelis 1990:2). Many could argue, in fact, that genuine participation is "feasible only in a political system in which efforts are undertaken to remedy economic and social injustice" (Bude 1985:275) -- where there is some 'space' provided for communities and NGOs to act and explore (Myers in press) and where greater participation in development is encouraged in all development sectors. It should be clear, however, that even in repressive societies there may be certain geographic regions, certain administrative levels of the nation, or "certain historic moments in the life of a nation [where] democratic spaces open up" (Picon 1990:5). Seizing these where available, and attempting to extend their reach, become critical tasks.

The second norm is one of *institutional change* -- a willingness on the part of the system and the institutions within it to adapt and adopt at least some new forms of work behaviour, new skills, and new ways of relating to others, and, in some cases, to employ new people with different values and objectives. To the extent that the institution and their strategies of change seek to move "away from using mechanistic strategies toward more open or adaptive strategies, the scope of change will be larger, and it will be necessary to use a slower, more bottom-up, and more participatory process of organisational change" (Rondinelli et al 1990:149).

Thirdly, greater collaboration also requires a commitment to the norm of greater professional *autonomy and empowerment* at the school level (Greenland 1990) and greater social autonomy and empowerment at the community level.

> *"In a development organization that seeks to be responsive, the dominant goal must be to facilitate self-determination among its clients or within the community with which it is dealing. The role of a government agency in this case is to provide support for community initiatives and to make available modest amounts of unrestricted resources. Beneficiaries are seen as independent initiators of activities".* [Rondinelli 1983:127]

This commitment to autonomy may imply the need for legal or quasi-legal frameworks for participation and certainly implies that the government is meant to become an enabler rather than a controller and regulator of local initiative and is "prepared to limit the role of the state sector and give more opportunity to the community sector to take a larger role in development activities" (Hadad 1983:19). This leads to greater tolerance of political competition, national and local; greater trust and delegation of authority to lower levels of the bureaucracy; and greater value placed upon group expression and group demands.

Finally, within the school itself, two norms -- *collegiality* and *continuous improvement* -- are particularly important.

> *"The first is collegiality, the notion that the work of teachers is shared, not to be done exclusively in the isolation of a classroom. Continuous improvement, the second work norm, reflects an expectation that improvements in teaching are continuous and life-long (rather than limited only to beginning teachers)....Schools where such norms are present and salient are characterized by frequent talk among teachers about the practice of teaching...; frequent observations by teachers; and teachers working together to plan, design, research, and prepare materials for teaching".* [Schwille et al 1986:16]

If these norms are present or potentially can be developed -- some public commitment to greater participation, to institutional change, and to greater autonomy, empowerment, and collegiality -- then a number of more specific factors and conditions can be more easily brought into play within the education system. These can be divided into conditions related to: *(1) resources; (2) knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviours; (3) structures*, and *(4) procedures*.

In terms of *resources*, the necessary condition is clear. The central government must be prepared to allocate (or reallocate) at least some funds and personnel to local levels. "Participation, if it is to be done well, has to be adequately and appropriately resourced; otherwise it is simply tokenism and does nothing to alter the knowledge balance, the skills balance, and the power balance in the community" (Brownlea 1987:607). This may take the form of additional staff charged with encouraging participation, the provision of incentives for the extra work often required in implementing more participatory processes, and resources provided directly to schools for school-improvement activities designed by the local partners.

But a change in *knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviours* -- the instilling of new capacities, roles, and values -- is probably even more important than an increase in funding (Hollnsteiner 1982, Allen 1982, Bhasin 1979, Roy 1984, Rondinelli et al 1990). As one observer notes, "the task of educating the communities toward participation is less difficult than that of educating administrators to accept it as a strategy" (Allen 1982:2). There is thus the need to re-train government officials -- administrators, politicians, technocrats, fieldworkers, and extension agents -- to become what has been called "social development managers". These are people who need "not only a capacity to break a problem down into its components, but also to view it in context -- to examine the characteristics of the system in which it is embedded; to be comfortable with diversity, multiplicity, simultaneity, uncertainty, and paradox; to pursue complex strategies involving multiple outcomes and simultaneous facilitating actions; to sense where there is harmony or 'fit' between two or more elements of a system and where there is discord; and to identify where, when, and how to intervene to improve fit or to generate a desired tension" (D. Korten 1981a:218-219).

Specifically, one principle capacity of those involved in 'people-centred development' is the ability to work collaboratively with people: that is, to be (1) patient, self-effacing, and flexible; (2) willing to share plans, procedures, and information openly and, especially, laterally; (3) tolerant both of conflict, dissent, and compromise and of active behaviours from active partners (rather than the usual passive 'recipient'); and (4) willing to see knowledge as residing in both professionals and beneficiaries. A particularly important part of such capacity is the willingness and ability to respond to the needs, knowledge, and experience of women -- those often most marginal to development processes but most critical to the process of education. Another is the ability to focus on process rather than product; to reflect, re-examine, explore alternatives, and confront novel situations; to revise plans and adjust to changing conditions; and to accept the necessity of trial and error, a slower pace of development, and the complexity and uncertainty of change (UNICEF 1986, NFE Exchange 1981).

In any school-based reform, a focus on the knowledge and skills of the headmaster is especially important. Leadership training is usually essential for headmasters in teacher support and supervision; in consistent and continuous implementation of change; in the clarification of policies, practices, and expectations; and in strengthening ties and collaboration with the local community (Zainal Ghani 1990). Teachers and teacher trainees can also be trained in these skills.

These kinds of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours are difficult to transmit through traditional top-down, 'cascade' methods. The training required is more usually horizontal, experiential, and community-based, and is often centred on group learning, case studies of concrete problems, field visits, and self-criticism (Bhasin 1979) -- the kinds of training which NGOs might be in the best position to offer to government personnel and fieldworkers. Guidebooks and manuals on specific issues are also useful; these include how to run meetings, how to strengthen local and self-reliant PTAs and encourage parental participation in them, how to delegate tasks and evaluate achievements, and how to analyse and overcome the passivity of long-ingrained poverty (Bray 1987).

Useful also are attempts to sensitise senior officials concerning the need to formulate and implement State policy to help "create a 'space' for NGOs to perform on the national development stage" and lower-level officials concerning the importance of participatory development paradigms (Bhatnagar 1990:19). Evidence of successful NGO involvement in development and of NGO-government collaboration may also help in this sensitisation process.

Another factor which can be strengthened through training and administrative decision relates to *structures* which can facilitate participation and collaboration. At the micro-level, school committees and parent-teacher organisations or more *ad hoc* groups for particular purposes such as curriculum development or fund-raising can be established and strengthened. These cannot simply be set up by fiat and expected to flourish; they require, instead, animation, resources, and continuous recognition and support (Bray 1986, Bude 1985). Other structures such as 'learning laboratories' -- where adults may follow literacy programmes, out-of-school can participate in youth various non-formal education courses, and pupils can pursue their regular school programmes -- might also be developed (D. Korten 1981, Anderson 1988).

At a macro-level, it is necessary to ensure strong *vertical* administrative structures (between the State and the community) -- not to impose centralised, standard decisions from above but rather to clarify national policies, standards, and basic content; guarantee the implementation of the procedures by which local actors can adapt and implement them; and serve as a conduit for information *up* the system as well as *down*. Equally strong *horizontal* structures and networks are also required, at both the national and local levels, of public, non-government, private, and community organisations (Hamadache 1990). Special inter-institutional and inter-disciplinary working groups or task forces of people from various offices of the system as well as organisations outside of the system, can also be formed to work on long-term problems (F. Korten). Trilateral forums among governments, donors, and NGOs and the creation of NGO liaison units to work with governments might also be useful (Bhatnagar 1990).

Finally, specific *procedures* can also be developed and implemented. These can include procedures at the micro (school) level and the macro (system) level. At the school level, methods can be developed which lead to greater collaboration among teachers and with headmasters and supervisors; to more systematic communication and interaction with parents and the community; and to more community consultation and collaborative planning in regard to the development and revision of school goals and objectives and the

implementation of school programmes (UNICEF 1982, Bude n.d., Fullan 1985). Schools or local district offices (as well as other levels of the system) can establish formal written policies regarding the role of parents and community advisory groups in school governance; encourage professional development activities attended by parents as well as teachers and administrators; and carry out community profiles and local surveys of needs, where possible with the assistance of local associations.

It is particularly important to establish procedures to encourage the development and adaptation of curriculum to local conditions so that site-specific factors and local expertise may be used. At the school and cluster level, both teacher and community panels may be established. Greater dialogue between the community and the school may be needed so that parents understand the need to improve the curriculum, clarify their needs and aspirations (perhaps after some collaborative information-gathering process) and then, within any existing national guidelines, help in drafting new curricula (Commonwealth Secretariat 1980, Bude n.d., Adams 1978).

At the macro-level other procedures can be established. National, system-wide guidelines can be drawn up concerning both desired levels and types of (1) decentralisation to district offices and to school and cluster committees, and (2) teacher, parent, and community involvement in areas such as those mentioned above. Legislation, policies, and practices concerning NGOs, community associations, teacher organisations, and private school systems can be reviewed to ensure that their efforts as partners in the improvement of basic education are encouraged and perhaps assisted. Information (such as about budgeting and staffing procedures) can be more widely shared with NGOs and regular communication established with them for the discussion of major educational problems. And, resources permitting, governments can assist community associations with technical expertise, logistical support, and seed money (Stiefel and Racelis 1990).

Procedures can also be initiated to allow greater flexibility in the timing and budgeting of often slow, time-consuming, and labour-intensive school-based improvement projects and to provide block grants for such projects, with accountability for these activities and other planning and budgeting processes pushed lower down in the system (Korten and Alfonso 1981, UNICEF International Child Development Centre 1990) -- even to the level of the community itself. And, very importantly, the government can make a more conscious effort to hire personnel committed to participatory processes. The evaluation of ministry and school personnel, at various levels, can use as a criterion the extent to which individuals have emphasized local capacity-building and participation in their work. This implies the need to discourage the rapid turn-over and transfer of effective personnel so that they have the time to implement more time-consuming participatory activities.

The encouragement of institutional norms of commitment, change, and autonomy; the provision or reallocation of additional resources; the inculcating of more supportive skills and attitudes; and the development of more flexible, collaborative procedures and structures can facilitate rather than hinder the greater participation of the various actors in education -- from the school and the community -- in educational policy and practice. This can help increase the demand for -- and the quality and relevance of -- education and may in turn reinforce other, more participatory processes of development. But these links are often

fragile, tenuous, and dependent on particular contexts and personalities. They are forged with difficulty, difficult to sustain, and easily broken. Governments and the agencies which support them -- especially at a time of educational crisis and socio-economic uncertainty -- must make a conscious effort to encourage the conditions which make greater participation possible.

Institutions responsible for training educational planners and administrators have a special responsibility in assisting in this effort. The International Institute for Educational Planning is in the process of developing a programme in this area which involves several stages of work:

(1) The Institute will identify relatively successful and sustained innovations where collaboration within and across schools, and between schools and other actors in education, has led to an increase in educational demand and quality. In the first instance, these experiences will derive from South and South-east Asia. Several innovative programmes have been selected in this regard. These include experiences in greater collaboration within and across schools via school clusters and teacher clubs, greater collaboration between schools and communities, and greater participation of parents in school affairs. Other programmes are now being sought in southern and eastern Africa in the areas of literacy and adult and community education.

(2) Case studies of these experiences will describe the kinds of collaboration carried out in the areas of resource collection and management, policy and governance, operations, and the instructional programme. These will also analyse the factors and conditions -- the organisational norms, skills and attitudes, structures, and procedures -- which facilitated such collaboration. Some additional studies of particularly significant experiences in other parts of the world (e.g., the process of 're-structuring' in North America) will also be carried out.

(3) Finally, for each set of cases, a regional seminar will bring together representatives of central ministries, government training institutes, the educational innovations studied, research institutes, NGOs, and donor agencies. These participants will analyse and synthesise the case studies and draw lessons from them in regard to the conditions and factors needed for greater collaboration. The Institute will then develop the materials, methods, and courses needed for training government officials at various levels of the system in the encouragement and implementation of collaboration for educational change.

Bibliography

Abreu de Armengol, M. No date. Non-formal and alternative approaches to provide primary level education for out-of-school children. Hamburg, UNESCO Institute of Education.

Adams, R. S. 1978. *Educational planning: towards a qualitative perspective*. Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Allen, J. 1982. Some operational issues relating to community participation. *Notes, comments...child, family, community*, N.S. 102, Paris, UNESCO.

Anderson, M.B. 1988. *Improving access to schooling in the Third World: an overview*. Series No. 1, BRIDGES Research Report, Cambridge, Harvard University.

Annis, S. 1987. Can small-scale development be a large-scale policy? The case of Latin America. In: A. G. Drabek *(ed.), Development alternatives: the challenge for NGOs*, supplement to *World development*, Vol. 15, pp. 129-134.

Arnstein, S.R. 1976. A ladder of citizen participation. In: E. Ingram and R. McIntosh (eds.), *Adaptative processes in educational organizations*, Edmonton, University of Alberta.

Bernard, A.K. 1990. Learning and intervention: The informal transmission of the knowledge and skills of development. Ottawa, International Development Research Centre, paper presented at the World Conference on Education for All, Thailand.

Bernard Van Leer foundation. 1990. Newsletter. No. 57, January.

Bhasin, K. 1979. *Breaking barriers: the South Asian experience of training for participatory development*. Bangkok, Food and Agricultural Organization.

Bhatnagar, B. 1990. Lessons learned: Nongovernmental Organizations and World Bank-supported projects in Asia. Washington, D.C., World Bank.

Bray, M. 1986. *New resources for education: community management and financing of schools in less-developed countries*. London, Commonwealth Secretariat.

_____. 1987. *School clusters in the Third World: making them work*. Paris, UNESCO-UNICEF Co-operative Programme.

Brownlea, A. 1987. Participation: myths, realities and prognosis. *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 605-614.

Bude, U. No date. *Developing institutional materials for African primary schools*. Bonn, German Foundation for International Development.

_____. 1985. *Primary schools, local communities, and development in Africa*. Baden-Baden, German Foundation for International Development.

_____. 1989. *The challenge of quality in primary education in Africa*. Bonn, German Foundation for International Development.

Bugnicourt, J. 1982. Popular participation in African development. In: *Assignment children*, UNICEF, Vol. 2, No. 59/60, pp. 57-77.

Charlick, R. 1980. Animation rurale: Experience with 'Participatory' development in four West African nations. *Rural development participation review*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 1-6.

Cogn, E.; Rossmiller, R. 1987. Research on effective schools: Implications for less developed countries. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 377-399.

Commonwealth Secretariat. 1980. *Participation, learning and change*. London.

Dave R. H; et al. 1990. *Meeting the basic learning needs of out-of-school children: non-formal approaches*. Hamburg, UNESCO Institute of Education.

Dove, L. 1980. The role of the community school in rural transformation in developing countries. *Comparative Education*, Vol. 16, No. 1.

Drabek, A. G. (ed.). 1987. *Development alternatives: the challenge for NGOs*, supplement to *World Development*, Vol. 15.

Dubbeldam, L. F. B. 1990. *Mobilizing resources for basic education*. Paper prepared for a meeting of the International Working Group on Education (IWGE), Paris.

Duke, C. 1990. *Grassroots approaches to combatting poverty through adult education. Adult education and development* supplement, No. 34, Bonn.

Durning, A. B. 1989. Mobilizing at the grassroots. In: *State of the World 1989*, Worldwatch, pp. 154-173.

Elliot, C. Some Aspects of relations between the North and South in the NGO Sector. In: A. G. Drabek (ed.), *Development alternatives: the challenge for NGOs*, supplement to *World Development*, Vol. 15, pp. 57-68.

Fullan, M. 1985. Change processes and strategies at the local level. *The Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 85, No. 3, pp. 391-421.

Garilao, E. 1987. Indigenous NGOs as strategic institutions: managing the relationship with Government and resource agencies. In A. G. Drabek (ed.), *Development alternatives: the challenge for NGOs*, supplement to *World Development*, Vol. 15, pp. 113-120.

Greenland, J. 1990. *Findings from the Aga Khan Foundation Projects*. Paper presented at a meeting of the International Working Group on Education, Paris, IIEP.

Gregg, D. 1989. *Collaborative school management in school district 56 (Nechako)*. British Columbia, Victoria, University of Victoria.

Hadad, I. 1983. *Development and community self-help in Indonesia*. PRISMA, Vol. 28, pp. 3-20.

Hall, B. n.d. *The role of NGOs in the field of adult education*. Toronto, International Council for Adult Education.

Hallak, J. 1990. *Investing in the future: setting educational priorities in the developing World*. Paris, UNESCO-International Institute for Educational Planning.

Hamadache, A. 1990. Education and non-formal approaches to primary education. Address given at the International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris.

Hollnsteiner, M.R. 1982. Understanding people's participation. In: *Notes, comments...child, family, community*, N.S. 119, Paris, UNESCO.

Ki-Zerbo, J. 1990. *Educate or perish: Africa's impass and prospects*. Dakar and Abidjan, UNESCO and UNICEF.

Korten, D.C. 1981. Rural development programming: the learning process approach. *Rural Development Participation Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 1-8.

_____. 1981a. Social development: putting people first. In: D. Korten and F. Alfonso (eds.), *Bureaucracy and the poor: closing the gap*. Manila, Asian Institute of Management, pp. 201-221.

_____. 1986. Micro-Policy Reform: The role of private voluntary development agencies. Working Paper No. 12, Washington, D.C., National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration.

_____. 1987. Third generation NGO strategies: A Key to People-Centred Development. In: A. G. Drabek (ed.), *Development alternatives: The challenge for NGOs*, supplement to *World Development*, Vol. 15, pp. 145-159.

_____Alfonso, F. 1981. *Bureaucracy and the poor: closing the gap*. Manila, Asian Institute of Management.

Korten, F. 1981. Community Participation. In: D. Korten and F. Alfonso (eds.), *Bureaucracy and the poor: closing the gap*. Manila, Asian Institute of Management, pp. 181-200.

_____. The Working Group as a Catalyst for Organizational Change. In: F. Korten and R. Siy, Jr. (eds.), *Transforming bureaucracy: the experience of the Philippine National Irrigation Administration*, Hartford, Connecticut, Kumarian Press.

Leslie, J.; Jamieson, D. 1990. Educational consequences of health problems among school age children. *Food and Nutrition Bulletin*, Vol. 12.

Myers, R. In press. *The twelve who survived.* Paris, UNESCO and the Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development.

Madan, T. N. 1987. Community involvement in health policy: Socio-Structural and Dynamic aspects of health beliefs. *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 25, No. 6, pp. 615-620.

NFE Exchange. 1981. Can participation enhance development? East Lansing, Michigan State University, Institute for International Studies in Education, No. 20, pp. 1-7.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 1988. *Voluntary aid for development: the role of non-governmental Organizations*. Paris.

_____. 1989. *Development Co-operation in the 1990s*. Paris.

Ogun, B. 1989. Internal UNICEF Memo, 26 October.

Pearse A.; MATHIAS S. 1980. *Debaters' comments on "Inquiry into participation: a research approach"*. Geneva, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Picon, C. 1990. *Principal and intermediate strategies in adult education and popular education for participation in civil society*. Manuscript.

Pinney, A. 1983. Partners in development? The Government and Non-Governmental Organizations in Indonesia. *PRISMA*, Vol. 28, pp. 33-45.

Prakasha, V.; et al. 1986. *Extending basic learning opportunities: challenges and responses*. Digest 16, Paris, UNESCO-UNICEF Co-operative Programme.

Prisma. 1983. Jakarta, Vol. 28. LP3ES.

Punch, K.; Bayona, E. 1990. Teacher participation in curriculum development: a model and field study in Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 253-268.

Ranaweera, A. M. 1990. *Innovative approaches to delivering Universal primary education and its democratization: a synopsis.* Hamburg, UNESCO Institute of Education.

Rondinelli, D. A. 1983. *Development projects as policy experiments.* London, Methuen.

Rondinelli, D.A.; et al. 1990. *Planning educational reforms in developing countries: The contingency approach.* Durham, Duke University Press.

Roy, A. (ed.) 1984. *Education of out-of-school children.* London, Commonwealth Secretariat.

Sander, B.; Murphy, P. 1989. *Administration and management of education: the challenges faced.* Paris, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Schwille J.; et al. 1986. *Recognizing, fostering and modeling the effectiveness of schools as organizations in Third World countries.* East Lansing, Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, draft.

Shaeffer, S. 1990. Participatory approaches to teacher training. In: Val Rust and Per Dalin (eds.), *Teachers and teaching in the developing world,* New York, Garland Press.

Singhal, R.P.; et al. 1986. *School inspection system: a modern approach.* Delhi, Vikas Publishing House.

Stallworth, J. T.; Williams, Jr., D. L. 1983. *A Survey of school administrators and policy-makers.* Washington, D.C., National Institute of Education.

Stiefel, M.; Racelis, M. 1990. The role and responsibilities of Government and development and donor agencies. Paper presented at the International Conference on Popular Participation in the Recovery and Development Process in Africa, Arusha, Tanzania.

Tandon, R. No date. NGO-Government relations: a source of life or a kiss of death. Toronto, International Council for Adult Education.

UNESCO-PROAP. 1990. Qualitative aspects of primary education. Occasional Papers No. 18, Bangkok.

UNICEF. 1982. *Community participation: current issues and Lessons Learned. assignment children,* Vol. 2, No. 59/60.

UNICEF. 1986. Community participation: now you see it, now you don't. UNICEF News, Issue 124, pp. 2-3.

_____. 1978. *Participatory research and basic needs, assignment children,* Vol. 41.

UNICEF. International Child Development Centre 1990, *Innocenti update.* No. 7.

WCEFA (World Conference on Education for All). 1990. *Meeting basic learning needs: a vision for the 1990s*. New York, WCEFA Inter-Agency Commission.

_____. 1990a. Framework for action to meet basic learning needs. New York, WCEFA Inter-Agency Commission.

Weiler, H.N. No date. *Decentralization in educational governance: an exercise in contradiction?* Unpublished.

Williams, P. 1989. African Education Under Siege. In: U. Bude (ed.), *The challenge of Quality in primary education in Africa*. Bonn, German Foundation for International Development, pp. 93-108.

Wils, F. 1990. *Income and employment generating activities of NGDOs: an overview*. Working Paper Series No. 88, The Hague, Institute of Social Studies.

Zainal Ghani. 1990. The use of participatory, school-based, and community - supported innovation in formal basic education. Ottawa, International Development Research Centre, paper prepared for the World Conference on Education for All, Thailand.

IIEP publications and documents

More than 650 titles on all aspects of educational planning have been published by the International Institute for Educational Planning. A comprehensive catalogue, giving details of their availability, includes research reports, case studies, seminar documents, training materials, occasional papers and reference books in the following subject categories:

Economics of education, costs and financing.

Manpower and employment.

Demographic studies.

The location of schools (school map) and sub-national planning.

Administration and management.

Curriculum development and evaluation.

Educational technology.

Primary, secondary and higher education.

Vocational and technical education.

Non-formal, out-of-school, adult and rural education.

Copies of the catalogue may be obtained from the IIEP on request.

The International Institute for Educational Planning

The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) is an international centre for advanced training and research in the field of educational planning. It was established by UNESCO in 1963 and is financed by UNESCO and by voluntary contributions from Member States. In recent years the following Member States have provided voluntary contributions to the Institute: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, India, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland.

The Institute's aim is to contribute to the development of education throughout the world, by expanding both knowledge and the supply of competent professionals in the field of educational planning. In this endeavour the Institute co-operates with interested training and research organizations in Member States. The Governing Board of the IIEP, which approves the Institute's programme and budget, consists of eight elected members and four members designated by the United Nations Organization and certain of its specialized agencies and institutes.

Chairman:
Victor Urquidi, (Mexico) Research Professor Emeritus, El Colegio de México, Mexico.

Designated Members:
Charles Boelen, Chief Medical Officer for Educational Planning, Methodology and Evaluation, Division of Health Manpower Development, World Health Organisation.
Goran Ohlin, Assistant Secretary-General, Office for Development, Research and Policy Analysis, Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations.
Visvanathan Rajagopalan, Vice President, Sector Policy and Research, Policy, Planning and Research, The World Bank.
Jeggan C. Senghor, Director, African Institute for Economic Development and Planning.

*Elected Members * :*
Isao Amagi, (Japan), Special Advisor to the Minister of Education, Science and Culture, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Tokyo.
Henri Bartoli, (France), Professor, University of Paris I, Pantheon-Sorbonne. Paris.
Mohamed Dowidar, (Egypt), Professor and President of the Department of Economics, Law Faculty, University of Alexandria.
Kabiru Kinyanjui, (Kenya), Senior Programme Officer, Social Sciences Division, International Development Research Centre, Nairobi.
Alexandre P. Vladislavlev, (USSR), First Secretary, All-Union Council of Scientific and Engineering Societies of the USSR, Moscow.
Lennart Wohlgemuth, (Sweden), Assistant Director-General, Swedish International Development Authority, Stockholm.

* (one vacancy)

Inquiries about the Institute should be addressed to:
The Director, International Institute for Educational Planning,
7-9 rue Eugène-Delacroix, 75116 Paris

Monograph N°. 3

In March 1990, the *World Conference on Education For All* issued a declaration which called upon governments, donor agencies, and non-government organisations -- in fact, all the various 'actors' in education -- to collaborate as partners in attempts to expand the quantity and improve the quality of basic education for children, youth and adults.

This monograph represents the conceptual framework being used at the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) in Paris in the development of a programme on 'collaborating for educational change'. It examines the nature, benefits, and disadvantages of participatory approaches to development, describes ways and areas in which such approaches can be utilised in education, and analyses the conditions and factors (organisational norms; knowledge, skills, and attitudes; administrative mechanisms and procedures) which can help to facilitate, rather than hinder, greater collaboration in educational development.

Although the monograph does not now review the quite varied but still limited practice of such participatory approaches in education, it will later be combined with a number of case studies of successful and sustained innovations characterised by collaboration within and across schools and between schools and local communities. These case studies, being carried out in Asia and Africa, will lead eventually to the preparation of training materials and courses designed to facilitate collaboration for educational change.

The author

Sheldon Shaeffer (Canada) is a senior research fellow at the IIEP. He joined the Institute in July 1990 from the International Development Research Centre in Canada where he was in charge of the Population, Education and Society Programme.